
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3162877

121 Harringay Road, Tottenham, London N15 3HP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David & Mrs Sarah Williams against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2322, dated 24 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as application for the uplift of existing permission, HGY/2015/1810 to include a loft conversion over the half of the rear side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The reason for refusal refers to the emerging Local Plan, including the Development Management DPD (the DM DPD) and specifically Policies DM1 and DM2. I note that the DM DPD is well-advanced and that the evidence indicates that the Examining Inspector has not raised any soundness issues or requested any modifications to those draft Policies. Nonetheless, it is not yet part of the adopted development plan and there is no specific evidence to indicate whether there are any outstanding objections to Policies DM1 and DM2. Consequently, at this stage based on the information before me, I can give DM DPD Policies DM1 and DM2 limited weight only.
3. In any event, given that Policy DM2 concerns accessibility and safe environments, I cannot see any reason why the Council's reason for refusal would indicate any conflict with this Policy and I have found none. I return to Policy DM1, which concerns design quality, a little later.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a mid-terraced house typical of many of the other houses in the vicinity. Some of these dwellings have a fairly conventional roof form featuring a central ridge with a consistent plane to the front descending to

- the eaves, which sit a little above the first floor windows. It appears likely that this is how the terraces on each side of the street were originally constructed.
6. Nonetheless, many of the houses have been altered over the years through the addition of mansard roofs, which largely feature a single central dormer to the front. Generally speaking these dormers are set behind the eaves and back from the principal front elevation of the terrace.
 7. There is a reasonably even balance in the area between these two broad types of roof form such that both exercise a strong influence on the character and appearance of the street scene, giving it a strong rhythm. Indeed to the south of the appeal property there are a number of houses with the mansard roof form while to the north there is a run of properties with the more traditional roof form. Consequently, a mansard roof extension at the appeal property would be acceptable as a matter of principle. Indeed the evidence indicates that there is an extant planning permission for such an extension.
 8. In my view the extant planning permission scheme would broadly respect the form and appearance of the other mansard roofs I observed in the area, as described above. In contrast, however, the current appeal scheme would incorporate a dormer window to the front elevation which would be relatively narrow and set well below the roof 'ridge' immediately above the eaves and flush with the principal front elevation of the house. This arrangement would be significantly at odds with the appearance of the other mansard roofs in the area such that it would appear awkward and significantly disrupt the rhythm of the terraced roofscape when viewed from Harringay Road.
 9. It is also proposed to introduce a roof extension to the rear of the appeal property above an existing two-storey outrigger. No such rear extension forms part of the extant planning permission scheme referred to above. While its design includes a sloping side facing roof plane, which might be said to mimic the form of a mansard roof, it has very few of the other features or wider form of the mansard roofs found in the area. This aspect of the proposals appears rather crude in its design and has very little regard to the pleasant architecture of the host house. I recognise that there is greater variety in the built form that can be seen to the rear of the terrace than to the street frontage and that there is a second floor flat roofed extension nearby. However, this does not justify poor design that would be incongruous and harmful to its overall context.
 10. There is a track to the rear of the site that runs parallel to Harringay Road, which provides access to the rear of the houses to the east and west. It can be accessed by vehicles and pedestrians to the south and by pedestrians only to the north. While accessible and apparently in use, there is no evidence to suggest that the track is public highway or a public right of way.
 11. Reasonably open views of the first floor and roof of the rear of the appeal property are available from this track. While it may not be heavily used, it does seem likely that the track is reasonably well used by pedestrians as an informal cut-through, by householders gaining rear access to their homes and by visitors to a car repair business located off it.
 12. Therefore, the extension proposed above the outrigger would be reasonably prominent. It would also be strikingly discordant to the host house and wider

terrace such that it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of both.

13. For the foregoing reasons, the proposed development at large would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, in that regard, it would conflict with London Plan 2015 Policies 7.4 and 7.6, Haringey Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 Policy UD3 and Policy DM1 of the DM DPD.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposals would not represent sustainable development in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework and that the appeal should be dismissed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR